DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 246 149 UD 023 666

TITLE	Improving Student Performance in California: Analysis of First Year's Education Legislation.
INSTITUTION	Berman, Weiler Associates, Berkeley, CA.
SPONS AGENCY	California Roundtable, San Francisco.
PUB DATE	Sep 83
NOTE	85p.; For a related document, see ED 239 759.
PUB TYPE	Viewpoints (120) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Academic Achievement; *Academic Standards; Administrator Qualifications; Cooperative Programs; *Educational Improvement; *Educational Policy; Elementary Secondary Education; Personnel Evaluation; Policy Formation; Principals; School Business Relationship; Staff Development; *State Legislation; Teacher Certification
IDENTIFIERS	California; *California Roundtable; *Senate Bill 813 (California 1983)

ABSTRACT

The California Roundtable (CRT) played a critical role in the shaping and passage of California's Senate Bill 813 (SB 813), the State's major education reform legislation enacted in July 1983. This working paper analyzes the content of the legislation, assesses its likely impact on student performance, and recommends steps the CRT (a consortium of business executives) might take to support improved student preparation in California. It is predicted that the new law will have a measurable effect on performance. And although student preparation for college and work may thus improve somewhat, additional legislative and non-legislative steps, the report holds, must be taken to bring the State's students up to an acceptable level. If the Roundtable chooses to remain active in helping to improve student performance, it should--according to this assessment--support legislation that: funds SB 813's reforms for 1984-85 and beyond; establishes essential personnel reforms omitted from SB 813; and strengthens measures that are included in SB 813 in incomplete or weakened form. Moreover, the Roundtable should actively seek long term solutions to the problem of providing adequate and stable financing for the public schools. Finally, in the non-legislative area, the Roundtable is encouraged to support the current plans of the Joint Business-Education Task Force on Mathematics and Science Education, and the establishment of a network of effective business/community/education programs. Extensive appendices to this report include (A) Reform provisions of SB 813; (B) Comparison of CRT legislative agenda with SB 813; and (C) the authors' recommendations for a new teacher certification process and a new principal selection and evaluation process. (Author/GC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED246149

IMPROVING STUDENT PERFORMANCE IN CALIFORNIA

ANALYSIS OF FIRST YEAR'S EDUCATION LEGISLATION

September 1983

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Mary M. Anderson
California Roundtable

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Berman, Weiler Associates
2000 Center Street, Box 1095
Berkeley, California 94704

UD023666

ABSTRACT

The California Roundtable (CRT) played a critical role in the shaping and passage of Senate Bill 813 (SB 813), the major education reform legislation enacted in July 1983. The CRT is now viewed as a major actor on the education policy scene.

The new law can be expected to have a measurable impact on student performance over the next few years. Though student preparation for college and work may thus improve somewhat, additional legislative and non-legislative steps must be taken to bring California students up to an acceptable level.

If the Roundtable chooses to remain active in helping to improve student performance, it should support legislation that:

- Funds SB 813's reforms for 1984-85 and beyond;
- Establishes essential personnel reforms omitted from SB 813;
- Strengthens measures that are included in SB 813 in incomplete or weakened form.

Moreover, the Roundtable should:

- Actively seek long term solutions to the problem of providing adequate and stable financing for the public schools.

In the non-legislative area, the Roundtable should support:

- The current plans of the Joint Business-Education Task Force on Mathematics and Science Education; and
- The establishment of a network of effective business/community/education programs.

CONTENTS

		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	ANALYSIS OF SB 813	3
III.	OVERALL ASSESSMENT	11
IV.	CONCLUSIONS	16
V.	RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE CRT ACTIONS	18

APPENDIX A: REFORM PROVISIONS OF SB 813

APPENDIX B: COMPARISION OF CRT LEGISLATIVE AGENDA WITH SB 813

APPENDIX C: BERMAN, WEILER ASSOCIATES' RECOMMENDATIONS FOR A NEW TEACHER CERTIFICATION PROCESS AND A NEW PRINCIPAL SELECTION AND EVALUATION PROCESS

I. INTRODUCTION

As part of a major commitment to help improve student preparation for college and work, the California Roundtable (CRT) in April 1982 hired Berman, Weiler Associates to provide an objective assessment of student performance in California and to prepare concrete recommendations to improve matters. The recommendations, contained in reports published in November 1982,* included legislative and non-legislative actions that the business community could support. The CRT approved these recommendations, and established working committees under the direction of the Jobs and Education Task Force to make CRT's views known to the public, the legislature, the Governor, and education interest groups.

These efforts played a critical role in the shaping and passage of a major education reform bill, Senate Bill 813. This legislation offers comprehensive reforms, and is fiscally responsible. However, to what extent will it accomplish the Roundtable's goal of improving student preparation?

---

*Improving Student Performance in California: Recommendations for the California Roundtable. Berkeley, CA: Berman, Weiler Associates, R-101/1, November 1982. Improving Student Performance in California: Recommendations for the California Roundtable, Executive Summary. Berkeley, CA: Berman, Weiler Associates, R-101/2, November 1982. Improving Student Performance in California: Recommendations for the California Roundtable, Appendix: A Review of Student Performance Data. Berkeley, CA: Berman, Weiler Associates, R-101/3, November 1982.

In addition to these published reports, Berman, Weiler Associates prepared numerous memoranda to the Jobs and Education Task Force, including a discussion of the effects of different spending and tax policies under a variety of economic growth assumptions; a background review of state finance issues; an agenda for personnel reforms; and a summary of the specifics of all reforms recommended to the CRT.

This working paper analyzes the content of the legislation, broadly assesses its likely impact on student performance, and recommends next steps the CRT might take to support improved student preparation in California.

II. ANALYSIS OF SB 813

Senate Bill 813, the Hughes-Hart Educational Reform Act of 1983, is a complex law containing many provisions that might improve student performance directly or indirectly. It addresses four major areas of reform: student standards, management efficiency, personnel quality, and education program effectiveness. The key provisions of the legislation are summarized in the first column of Table 1. Appendix A provides a more detailed list, and Appendix B compares SB 813 provisions to the CRT legislative agenda, which was presented to legislators, the Governor, the Superintendent of Public Instruction (SPI), and interest group representatives. The legislation incorporates most of the CRT agenda items, though some are omitted and others are included in a partial or weakened version.

The second column of Table 1 summarizes our broad assessment of the potential impact on student performance of each key provision of SB 813. Each provision is rated on the following scale: Very High Potential Impact, High Potential Impact, Moderate Potential Impact, Some Potential Impact, Little or No Potential Impact, and Negative Potential Impact.

The third column of Table 1 provides a rough assessment of the relative cost to the state budget of each provision. SB 813 appropriates $800 million to pay for these reforms and to provide an eight percent increase for inflation in state funding for school districts.* This is $450 million more than the Governor had originally requested for state

---

*Six percent for all categorical programs, except special education programs, which received eight percent.

TABLE I

ANALYSIS OF KEY FEATURES OF SB 813

SB 813 PROVISION	POTENTIAL IMPACT ON STUDENT PERFORMANCE	RELATIVE COST TO STATE BUDGET	COMMENT
RAISING STUDENT STANDARDS*			
1. Establishes mandatory graduation standards (A.1.)	High	None (funded by COLA)	Some districts may have to move too quickly to maintain quality courses; "work experience" may be substituted by students for required courses, thereby weakening the impact of the new law.
2. Requires local curricula reassessment (A.2., 3.)	High	Low (cost borne by districts	No formal means for compliance review.
3. Increases funding for textbooks (A.6.)	Moderate	Moderate ($36M in 1983-84)	Quality review left to SPI, and is limited to courses required for graduation.
4. Expands state testing program (A.7.)	Some	Low (.25M)	If new tests are used, data could be hard to compare to existing longitudinal data.
5. Provides incentives for longer school day and year(A.9.,10.,11.)	High	Very high ($256M in 1984-85)	Districts may have difficulty staffing additional courses with quality instructors.
6. Strengthens authority to discipline students (A.12.-18.)	Some	None	The problem of student discipline and respect for authority depends primarily on attitudes and quality of staff. Stronger laws help, but are not critical.

*Letters and numbers in parentheses following each key provision refer to relevant specifics of the legislation as enumerated in Appendix A.

TABLE I (continued)

SB 813 PROVISION	POTENTIAL IMPACT ON STUDENT PERFORMANCE	RELATIVE COST TO STATE BUDGET	COMMENT
IMPROVING MANAGEMENT EFFICIENCY			
A. Personnel Management			
1. Makes it easier to discipline, dismiss or lay off teachers (B.1.d.-h., j., k.)	Some	None (possible cost savings to districts)	Changes in dismissal procedures may be too weak to achieve desired benefits.
2. Allows broad exceptions to seniority rules in layoff and rehiring (B.1.l.)	Some	None	Districts could abuse rules to lay off senior teachers as cost saving measure.
3. Makes it easier to dismiss administrators (B.1.l.,m.,n.)	Some	None	Districts previously had authority to dismiss administrators; new law reduces length of needed time to dismiss and makes related changes.
4. Reduces teacher probationary period to two years, with new district authority to dismiss during that time (B.1.c.)	Some	None	Measure not linked to comprehensive reform of credentialing/apprenticeship system.
5. Encourages local experiments in personnel and management practices (B.1.a.)	Little or none	Little or none (not funded specifically)	No funding level specified; program has inadequate (two year) life span unless renewed by legislature.
B. School Administration and Governance			
1. Establishes temporary state Commission on Governance and Management (B.2.c.)	Little or none	Little	Commission's charter may be too broad to yield useful recommendations; Commission is composed of political figures rather than impartial experts.
2. Directs SPI to review program guidelines (B.2.a.)	Some	Little or none	Efficiency measure.

TABLE I (continued)

SB 813 PROVISION	POTENTIAL IMPACT ON STUDENT PERFORMANCE	RELATIVE COST TO STATE BUDGET	COMMENT
IMPROVING MANAGEMENT EFFICIENCY (cont'd)			
C. Facility Utilization			
1. Provides incentives for year-round schools (B.3.a.)	Little or none	Some (possible cost savings)	Efficiency measure.
2. Creates new directives on facility sharing (B.3.c., e.)	Little or none	None (possible cost savings)	Efficiency measure.
3. Requires tighter facility use planning (B.3.b., h.)	Little or none	None (possible cost savings)	Efficiency measure.
IMPROVING THE QUALITY OF SCHOOL PERSONNEL			
A. Attracting and Retaining Quality Teachers			
1. Creates college loan assumption program for students who agree to teach in high demand areas for three years (C.1.d.)	High	(not funded yet)	Program may not be cost effective if most participants leave teaching after three years.
2. Raises beginning teacher salaries (C.1.e.)	High	Moderate ($12M in 1983-84, $24M in 1984-85)	Without added increment for math and science teachers, raise may not be adequate to attract math and science students to teaching.

TABLE I (continued)

SB 813 PROVISION	POTENTIAL IMPACT ON STUDENT PERFORMANCE	RELATIVE COST TO STATE BUDGET	COMMENT
IMPROVING THE QUALITY OF SCHOOL PERSONNEL (cont'd)			
A. Attracting and Retaining Quality Teachers (cont'd)			
3. Allows teacher trainees to teach in high schools before obtaining credentials(C.1.b.)	Some	None	Depends on successful implementation of teacher mentor program.
4. Provides opportunities for math and science teachers to teach summer school (C.1.a.)	High	Moderate ($40M in 1984-85)	Summer school enrollment in math, science, or other core academic areas is limited to five percent of a district's total enrollment.
B. Improving the Quality of Existing Staff			
1. Requires teachers to obtain continuing evaluation to renew credentials (C.2.a.)	Negative	None (cost to be borne by schools, districts, & teachers)	Research shows that teachers must be intrinsically motivated to benefit from additional training; mandatory training may impede improvement of staff development by providing captive audience.
2. Expands staff development programs (C.2.d.)	Some	Some ($5M in 1984-85)	Traditional staff development approaches have not worked well in secondary schools.
3. Funds training programs for principals (C.2.e.)	Some	Little ($.5M in 1984-85)	Programs not yet designed and funding is too low to reach many principals.
4. Permits districts to require teachers with low evaluations to attend training sessions (C.2.f.)	Moderate	None (cost to be borne by districts)	Poor teachers are unlikely to benefit significantly from staff development programs unless such programs are carefully tailored to address the teachers' needs. In some cases, even such training will not be effective.

TABLE I (continued)

SB 813 PROVISION	POTENTIAL IMPACT ON STUDENT PERFORMANCE	RELATIVE COST TO STATE BUDGET	COMMENT
IMPROVING THE QUALITY OF SCHOOL PERSONNEL (cont'd)			
B. Improving the Quality of Existing Staff (cont'd)			
5. Creates mentor teacher program (C.2.b.)	High	Moderate ($40.5M in 1983-84)	Opposition by local teacher organizations could undermine effectiveness.
6. Requires reassigned teachers to pass subject test if they are to teach in area where they have had no formal training (C.2.g.)	Moderate	Little	Permits teachers with appropriate credential or college major to teach even if they have not taught that subject for many years.
IMPROVING PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS			
A. New Programs			
1. Creates specialized high schools for high technology and performing arts (D.1.a.)	Moderate	Some ($2M in 1984-85)	Schools could pull best teachers and students out of other nearby schools.
2. Provides grants to teachers for improving instruction (D.1.b.)	Moderate	Moderate ($18M in 1984-85)	Could encourage numerous projects that have not been well thought through.
3. Establishes program of grants to schools that show improved test scores (D.1.c.)	Little or none	Moderate ($7M in 1984-85)	Test scores are influenced by many non-school factors, and many deserving schools maintain stable scores against long odds.

TABLE I (continued)

SB 813 PROVISION	POTENTIAL IMPACT ON STUDENT PERFORMANCE	RELATIVE COST TO STATE BUDGET	COMMENT
IMPROVING PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS (cont'd)			
A. New Programs (cont'd)			
4. Creates a program of grants to colleges & universities to work with secondary schools (D.1.d.)	Moderate	Some ($1M in 1984-85)	Unless broadly interpreted in practice, may be useful primarily to college-bound students.
5. Reestablishes academic and career counseling programs (D.1.e.)	Little or none	Moderate ($6M in 1984-85)	Does not include measures to improve the quality of counseling services, which have been weak in many schools.
B. Improvements to Existing Programs			
1. Requires 85 percent of categorical funds be spent on services to students (D.2.a.)	Some	None	Efficiency measure.
2. Simplifies School Improvement Program funding and allows waiver of planning requirements (D.2.b.)	Little or none	Moderate ($10M in 1984-85)	Waiving the planning requirements would eliminate the most effective aspect of the program.
3. Expands district authority to use categorical funds on schoolwide basis (D.2.c.)	Some	None	Efficiency measure.
4. Refines other laws pertaining to categorical and other programs (D.2.d.-o.)	Little	None	Efficiency measures.

education funding for 1983-84, but $400 million to $250 million below what Assembly and Senate Democrats, respectively, had wanted. At the time of the legislation's passage in July 1983, the Conference Committee projected SB 813 1984-85 expenditures of $976 million in addition to $799 million in carry forward funding from 1983-84.* The Governor has vetoed all appropriation language for 1984-85 and beyond. Consequently, the relative costs indicated in Table 1 are uncertain. Relative costs to the state budget are shown, rather than exact amounts, because most SB 813 provisions do not contain a specific allocation. The relative costs are judged on the following scale: Very High Costs ($200 million or greater), High Costs ($100-200 million), Moderate Costs ($10-100 million), Some Costs ($1-10 million), and Low or None ($0-1 million).

The next section discusses overall assessments implied by Table 1.

---

*These figures represent early estimates by Conference Committee staff, and may be revised.

III. OVERALL ASSESSMENT

Table 1 shows that some provisions of SB 813 can be expected to have a high impact on student performance, whereas others probably will not. Thus, this year's legislation can only be viewed as a first step toward bringing California students up to adequate levels of performance. Nonetheless, some of the reforms are important and should produce measurable results within a few years.

The following discussion reviews each of the four major areas of reform listed in Table 1, and assesses the potential combined impact on student performance of the key provisions in each area.

RAISING STUDENT STANDARDS

As Table 1 points out, three provisions of SB 813 in this area can be expected to have a high impact on student performance: new graduation requirements, mandatory local curricula reassessments, and a longer school day and year. These provisions speak directly to the serious erosion of standards that has occurred over the last 10-15 years, and reinstitute badly needed state leadership.

Another provision of the bill--strengthening the laws on student discipline and attendance--is likely to have some impact, as shown in Table 1, though it is not necessarily central to improving student performance. Student discipline problems are often the result of low standards, poor teaching, low quality teachers, and weak administration. Schools that have these problems are unlikely to use the extra authority provided by SB 813.

One area that needs considerable strengthening in SB 813 is that of improving the quality of textbooks in secondary schools. The legislation requires the Superintendent of Public Instruction to review texts for secondary schools, but otherwise does not specify how textbook quality would be upgraded. The legislation primarily provides much needed additional money for texts. However, if poor quality texts are purchased with this money, the students will not benefit.

IMPROVING MANAGEMENT EFFICIENCY

This area has the three subparts shown in Table 1--personnel management, school administration and governance, and facility utilization.

Personnel Management

Under personnel management, SB 813 takes important steps to strengthen the ability of school districts to manage personnel more efficiently. Though these provisions cannot be expected to have direct, major impact on student performance, they address critical issues that must be improved if other reform measures are to be effective. The new law makes it easier to discipline or dismiss poor teachers, lay off teachers when budget problems or mandated curriculum changes make that necessary, and hire or rehire to meet program needs rather than seniority requirements. And administrators have been put under more direct control of district management. Despite the provisions of SB 813, it is still more difficult than it should be to dismiss an incompetent teacher, and the law should be further strengthened. Yet, weaknesses notwithstanding, the public may receive the message that the legislature was willing to act on questions of teacher discipline where reform has been overdue.

The fifth provision listed in Table 1 under personnel management--local experiments in personnel and management practices--needs strengthening. No funding levels have been specified and the program has a two-year life span (unless renewed), which is wholly inadequate.

School Administration and Governance

Under school administration and governance, provisions to improve the efficiency of state administration and local governance are essentially missing--residing almost entirely in a new temporary political commission charged with studying the problem. However, except for the controversial issue of district size, these issues are unlikely to have a direct bearing on student performance, which depends more heavily on state and local standards, good teaching, and community support than on streamlining the governance of education.

Facility Utilization

In a similar vein, changes in the law to enhance the efficiency of facility utilization--the last heading--are sensible and needed, but not central to improving student performance.

IMPROVING THE QUALITY OF SCHOOL PERSONNEL

This area is divided into the two subparts shown in Table 1--attracting and retaining quality teachers, and improving the quality of existing staff.

Attracting and Retaining Quality Teachers

Under this heading, the legislation contains two very important provisions that could help to attract good people into teaching, particularly in math and science: a college loan assumption program, and

an increase in beginning teachers' salaries. While beginning (or lifetime) salaries for public school teachers are unlikely to compete with those offered by private industry for math or science majors, the gap should be narrowed as much as possible, and SB 813 has taken an important step in that direction. Allowing teacher trainees to begin teaching (and earning money) before obtaining a credential, and re-opening summer school teaching opportunities for some math and science teachers, should also contribute to attracting and retaining quality staff.

Improving the Quality of Existing Staff

With one exception, SB 813's provisions to improve the quality of existing staff are unlikely to be effective. These provisions rely heavily on standard staff development practices. However, the literature on staff development, especially at the secondary school level, suggests that the policy instruments used in SB 813--TEC Centers, training programs for administrators, and mandatory training for teachers who receive low evaluations--will not make a major difference, particularly among poorly trained, poorly motivated, or incompetent teachers or administrators. SB 813 ends the award of lifetime teaching credentials, but permits credential renewal every five years provided that teachers attend staff development sessions. This requirement is likely to produce effects contrary to those intended by the law: It could increase teacher cynicism and pro-forma attendance at training sessions, while reducing the intrinsic motivation teachers must have in order to benefit from additional training.

On the other hand, SB 813 contains the first serious master teacher legislation to be passed in California. This feature, if well implemented, could improve the quality of training for new teachers, and make teaching a more attractive career both for potential newcomers and for current staff who are seeking new challenges.

Finally, SB 813 provides a weaker measure than necessary to require reassigned teachers who do not have a credential or college major in their new subject to pass a subject competency test. Under this provision, for example, a teacher with a college major in mathematics who has been teaching social studies for 15 years would not be retested. Future legislation should require teachers to pass a subject competency test if they have not taught the subject for a specified period of time (perhaps three to ten years, depending on the subject).

IMPROVING PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS

The legislation in this area includes new programs and improvements to existing programs. Among the new programs, three provisions (listed as numbers 1, 2, and 4 in Table 1) hold moderate promise: specialized high schools for high technology and the performing arts, direct grants to teachers for improving instruction, and grants to colleges and universities for working with secondary schools to improve instruction and counseling. Each of these programs, if well implemented, could help directly to provide advanced, high quality instruction for talented students, though the potential benefits may not be worth the costs.

The provisions listed as improvements to existing programs are aimed at improving program efficiency, and are not directed toward improving student performance per se.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

The greatest strength of SB 813 is its tightening of student standards. These measures are fundamental to any reform effort, and are carefully written in the legislation. The new law has also taken important first steps to attract more high quality teachers into the profession, and has made useful changes in personnel management. While the latter reforms are less likely to have a direct impact on student performance, they may make teachers and administrators more accountable for their performance, and may thereby help to regain public support for education.

The greatest weakness of SB 813 is its failure to come to grips with the full range of personnel issues that must be tackled before full and lasting reform is possible.

All of the key reforms in SB 813--tougher student standards, measures to attract quality teachers, the master teacher provision, improvements in personnel administration--are necessary components of any package of measures designed to improve student performance. In the long run, however, the impact of these reforms will depend on the quality and effectiveness of teachers and school administrators.

Because many teachers and adminstrators will be retiring over the next decade, the best hope for upgrading the quality of the teaching force and the administrative cadre is to reform the procedures by which these professionals are licensed and hired. This is SB 813's most important unfinished business.

In particular, the impact of SB 813 on student performance will be severely limited if steps are not taken to deal with two crucial areas

that were not included in the legislation, despite the efforts of the Jobs and Education Task Force:

- Reform of the teacher credentialing and apprenticeship system
- Introduction of new procedures for the selection and evaluation of school principals.

Appendix C presents our recommendations in these areas; the recommendations were endorsed by CRT and disseminated to legislators, the Governor, the Superintendent of Public Instruction, and interest groups.

On balance, SB 813 has made a critically important contribution to education reform in California. It is, however, only a first step. As such, it has raised public expectations that cannot be met unless additional steps are now taken--both in legislation and in other arenas. If, because of a failure to follow through, genuine improvements in student performance do not occur, public education could face additional decline and further public disenchantment.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE CRT ACTIONS

The California Roundtable deserves a major share of the credit for the shaping and passage of SB 813. The CRT played a critical role in making sure that more money for education was linked to reforms and, more particularly, that the legislation included:

- Strong measures to upgrade student standards;
- Key steps to attract more high quality teachers into the profession;
- Tougher personnel management rules; and
- The introduction of a provision for master teachers, a provision that could represent a step toward merit pay.

The CRT is now viewed as an important actor on the education scene. It once again could greatly influence whether California continues efforts to improve student performance or stops short of the far-reaching changes needed.

If the Roundtable chooses to press on, it should do so in both the legislative and non-legislative arenas. As next steps in the <u>legislative arena</u>, the Roundtable should support:

- Funding SB 813's reforms for 1984-85 and beyond, including funding for reforms whose implementation was postponed to 1984-85.
- Passage of essential personnel reforms omitted from SB 813 (teacher credentialing, principal selection and evaluation, etc.)
- Strengthening measures included in SB 813 in an incomplete or weakened form (e.g., textbook improvement, testing of teachers who are assigned to teach a subject they have not taught for some time, innovative local experiments).

Moreover, the Roundtable should:

- Actively seek long term solutions to the problem of providing adequate and stable financing for the public schools.

In the non-legislative arena, the most pressing short-run problem is the crisis in mathematics and science education. Business and industry working together with colleges and universities could do much to alleviate the crisis by means detailed in an earlier Berman, Weiler Associates report.* If the Roundtable decides to move ahead in this area, it should:

- Support the current plans of the Joint Business-Education Task Force on Mathematics and Science Education.

In the longer run, improved public education depends on how much business, parents, and communities actively involve themselves in their local schools. The CRT has begun to work in this crucial area, but more needs to be done. Leadership from the business community is needed here because neither the government nor the schools have the boldness or vision to act. The Roundtable could help by:

- Supporting the establishment of a network of effective business/community/education programs.

---

*Improving Student Performance in California: Recommendations for the California Roundtable. Berkeley, CA: Berman, Weiler Associates, R-101/1, November 1982.

APPENDIX A

REFORM PROVISIONS OF SB 813

APPENDIX A

REFORM PROVISIONS OF SB 813*

The following list provides summary statements of each of the education reform provisions of SB 813.

A. RAISING STUDENT STANDARDS

1. Mandates core courses for high school graduation for all students:

   - o Three years of English
   - o Two years of math
   - o Two years of science, including physical and biological science
   - o Three years of social science, U.S. and world history and culture, economics, geography, American government, and civics
   - o One year of fine arts or foreign language

2. Requires the Superintendent of Public Instruction to develop model curriculum standards and review textbooks for courses required for graduation.

3. Requires districts to review their curricula every three years, and to adopt curricula that meet or exceed model standards developed by the Superintendent of Public Instruction.

4. Requires the Superintendent of Public Instruction to develop a course of study in computer education.

5. Institutes Golden State high achievement tests for seniors to obtain honors at graduation.

6. Increases funds for school textbooks in grades K-8 and provides first-time funding in grades 9-12.

7. Expands the statewide student testing program to include grade 8 and add higher level thinking skills to test content.

8. Requires superintendent to report to the legislature on ways to guarantee that high school accreditation ensures high quality programs.

---

*Adapted from SB 813 Conference Committee report.

9. Provides incentives to school districts to extent the school year from 175 to 180 days (1984-85)

10. Provides incentives to school districts to lengthen the school day, including a six-period high school day (1984-85).

11. Prohibits any reduction of instructional time below 1982-83 levels.

12. Provides for mandatory expulsion and suspension for serious violations and increases number of administrators who may suspend pupils.

13. Prohibits students suspended from one class being placed in another, and requires supervision by appropriate school personnel when student remains on school grounds.

14. Provides teachers with authority to require suspended students to do makeup work.

15. Permits use of written testimony at expulsion hearings when witnesses are at risk of harm.

16. Requires districts to adopt policies so that teachers may fail students for excessive absences.

17. Requires notification of parents of truant students that they may be in violation of law.

18. Requires districts to adopt policies on student retention and promotion.

19. Requires the Superintendent of Public Instruction to develop a study of the characteristics of students dropping out of school before graduating from high school.

B. IMPROVING MANAGEMENT EFFICIENCY

1. Personnel Management

a. Authorizes school districts to establish innovative local experiments to strengthen and streamline personnel and management practices.

b. Requires local school boards to establish policies to certify administrator competence to evaluate teachers: policies relating to new teachers' needs for training; and policies on parent grievance procedures.

c. Gives school districts discretion to dismiss probationary employees during the first two years on the basis of district-determined criteria.

d. Deletes requirement for prior semester notice to teachers charged with unprofessional conduct or incompetency.

e. Reduces from 90 to 45 days notice to teachers charged with unprofessional conduct.

f. Requires that discovery shall occur no more than 30 days after employee receives accusations.

g. Allows local boards to utilize intermediate sanction of suspension for permanent employees or probationary employees. Due process is locally determined. For permanent teachers the process is subject to hearing before three-member panel.

h. Provides that non-substantive procedural errors will not reverse decisions in dismissals or layoffs of teachers.

i. Allows school boards to make exceptions to the seniority rule for purposes of layoffs, reassignments, and rehiring of certificated staff. Exceptions to be based on the special training and experience of teachers.

j. Allows school districts to lay off certificated personnel between five days after Governor signs the state budget through August 15, if the district's total revenue increase per ADA is not two percent or greater.

k. Allows districts to lay off personnel when changes in state law modify curriculum.

l. Reduces notice for administrator dismissal to 45 days.

m. Prohibits school administrators from accumulating seniority as teachers after they have been in administrative positions for more than three years.

n. Allows districts to remove senior managers from permanent status in senior management positions.

o. Allows school districts to pay "laid off" teachers who are used as substitutes at substitute rate for 20 days within 60 school days. If the person works 21 days or more, the pay returns to the person's pro rata level for all days worked. Days must be in same district, but not consecutive or in same assignment or in same school.

2. School Administration and Governance

a. Requires the Superintendent of Public Instruction to review all program guidelines for clarity, necessity, and legal authority.

b. Requires the Superintendent to inform school districts that guidelines are not mandates.

c. Creates a temporary state Commission on School Governance and Management to assess the advisability of consolidating some functions of various governmental units; optimum school and district size; ways of reducing duplication of activities among local, regional and state agencies; and the growth in numbers of non-teaching personnel over the past 12 years.

d. Includes language that if ACA 44 (Naylor) is passed by the legislature it will appear on the June 1984 primary ballot. ACA 44 establishes an education trust fund to provide stability to school financial planning. Schools would know by April 1 how much money they will receive.

3. Facility Utilization

a. Provides incentives to encourage year-round use of schools to save state capital outlay costs.

b. Provides that districts applying for state school construction funding may be required to develop and implement a five-year plan for facility needs.

c. Requires districts with vacant schools to make first offer of use of schools to adjacent districts with overcrowding.

d. Reduces matching fund requirements for purchase of an additional percentage of relocatable structures.

e. Permits intergovernmental agreements for joint use of facilities.

f. Continuously appropriates state school deferred maintenance fund.

g. Allows lease proceeds for routine district facility repair.

h. Requires the State Department of Education to study the feasibility of an automated facility inventory and architectural design standards and materials for school facilities.

C. IMPROVING THE QUALITY OF SCHOOL PERSONNEL

1. Attracting and Retaining Quality Teachers

a. Institutes summer school for math, science, and other critical academic areas.

b. Allows high schools the opportunity to hire teacher trainees with BAs, passing scores on CBEST and subject matter exams, provided that such trainees have the assistance of a mentor teacher and have an individualized training plan.

c. Establishes a pilot project to assist school districts in the recruitment and selection of administrative personnel.

d. Creates a college loan assumption program in critical teacher shortage areas, particularly science and math.

e. Increases beginning teacher salaries by 30 percent over 3 years. Caps such increases at $18,000, adjusted for inflation.

f. Requires education school faculty who teach courses in teaching methods to work directly with teachers in K-12 classrooms, at least once every three years.

2. Improving the Quality of Existing Staff

a. Requires all persons obtaining a clear teaching credential after September 1, 1985 to complete 150 hours of continuing education within each 5 year period to maintain their credential.

b. Creates a teacher mentor program which links mentors with beginning teachers in need of assistance, guidance, and training. Pays a stipend of $4,000 to such outstanding teachers.

c. Allows local bargaining for teacher pay based on factors other than years of service and education.

d. Expands teacher staff development in Teacher Education and Computer Centers, emphasizing math, science, and computer education.

e. Funds training programs to improve principals' skills in evaluating and assisting teachers.

f. Allows districts to require continuing education for teachers who receive negative evaluations.

g. Requires competency tests for all certificated personnel reassigned or assigned to teaching positions if they do not hold a credential or college major in the appropriate subject.

D. IMPROVING PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS

1. New Programs

a. Targets funds to the development of specialized high schools in high technology and performing arts in order to provide models for other schools throughout the state (1984-85).

b. Provides mini-grants to teachers to improve classroom instruction (1984-85).

c. Funds a pilot program to reward high schools for improving their students' academic achievement (1984-85).

d. Creates the California Academic Partnership Program to provide grants to colleges and universities for assisting secondary schools with critically needed instructional improvement (1984-85).

e. Reestablishes a strong academic and career counseling program, to assure that every tenth grade student receives an individual record review and appraisal of his or her educational options.

2. Improvements to Existing Programs

a. Requires that 85 percent of categorical funds go to direct services to students.

b. Simplifies and equalizes funding for the School Improvement Program and allows the Superintendent of Public Instruction to waive planning requirements.

c. Expands local district authority to use categorical aid on a schoolwide basis (an estimated increase of 1500 schools).

d. Requires the State Board of Education and the Superintendent of Public Instruction to review bilingual exit critiera.

e. Requires maintenance of Economic Impact Aid funding in secondary schools and allow waivers of any Education Code laws or regulations to improve pupil services in schools receiving Economic Impact Aid funds.

f. Allows high school districts and feeder elementary schools to be considered "unified" for receipt of Urban Impact Aid (1984-85).

g. Provides a cost of living adjustment for special education programs tied to school district revenue limits.

h. Revises and clarifies the formula for funding of adult education programs.

i. Consolidates regular and special transportation programs and speeds up state reimbursement to districts (1984-85).

j. Provides funding for the replacement of unsafe school buses for small rural school districts.

k. Revises the "sunset" dates for categorical programs, including adult education, driver training, environmental education, career guidance centers, and transportation.

l. Provides state funds for equipment and capital outlay for agriculture vocational education programs.

m. Strengthens the tasks of continuation schools for high school students and expands accessibility to opportunity schools for seventh to ninth grade students.

n. Requires regional occupational programs and centers to focus additional funding on training for youth.

o. Requires review of apprenticeship programs by the Superintendent of Public Instruction and Chancellor of the Community Colleges, and makes other necessary changes in apprenticeship program funding.

SB 813 EXPENDITURES 1983-84

	(Millions)
District Revenue Limits @ 8%	$ 288.3
- Includes minimum guarantee - Includes $50 million from 1982-83 - Includes moving low revenue limit districts to within $50 of 1982-83 average - No district will receive less than 1982-83 level of funding - No district will receive more than 15% per ADA increase - Districts above 105% of the average will receive growth ADA at 105% level	
COLAs for categorical programs at 6% with special education at 8%	92.5
Instructional materials--current statute for grades K-8; new funds for grades 9-12	35.9
Increase minimum teacher salaries	12.0
$4,000 per mentor for Teaching Mentor Program	10.5
Adult education 6% COLA	7.6
Counseling for all 10th grade students	6.0
Necessary small school revenue limits	3.0
Agriculture vocational education equipment	3.0
COLA at 8% for county superintendents	7.3
Small school district bus purchases	1.0
Educational technology per AB 803 (contingent on AB 803 enactment)	.5
Continue California Writing Project	.2
Implement 8th grade level test for California Assessment Program	.25
Unemployment insurance for State Special Schools	.25
Develop two exams for the Golden State Exam Program	.1
Student Aid Commission: Administrative Funds for Teacher Loan Forgiveness Program	.1
SB 813 Total 1983-84	$ 468.5
1983 Governor's Budget Amount	$ 330.8
GRAND TOTAL 1983-84 over 1982-83	$ 799.3

SB 813 PROJECTED EXPENDITURES 1984-85

	(Millions)
Revenue Limit Apportionment (COLA and Equalization)	$ 374.7
Extended School Year/School Day	256.0
Maintenance of 1983-84 Categorical COLAs	105.9
Federal Impact Aid	26.3
Minimum Teacher Salaries	24.0
Teacher Mentors	30.0
County Offices: Maintenance of 1983-84 COLA	7.7
Instructional Materials	37.9
Tenth Grade Counseling	6.0
Small Schools Apportionments	3.2
Summer School	40.0
Mini-Grants to Teachers	18.0
S.I.P. Expansion	10.0
Urban Impact Aid Expansion	9.0
Year Round Schools	7.5
Educational Performance Incentive	7.0
TEC Centers	5.0
Opportunity Classes/Programs	4.0
Specialized High Schools	2.0
Academic Partnership Program	1.0
Administrator Training Program	0.5
Total SB 813 for 1984-85	$ 975.7
SB 813 1983-84 Carry Forward	799.3
Total 1984-85 Costs Over 1982-83	$1,775.0

APPENDIX B

COMPARISON OF CRT LEGISLATIVE AGENDA WITH SB 813

APPENDIX B

COMPARISION OF CRT LEGISLATIVE AGENDA WITH SB 813

The CRT's legislative agenda is listed below. Each agenda item is followed by a box that indicates the relevant provisions in SB 813.

A. RAISE EDUCATIONAL STANDARDS

1. Minimum Graduation Requirements

All districts should be required to implement minimum graduation requirements, including at least three years of English, two years of math, two years of science, three years of social studies, and one year of fine arts.

In SB 813: Yes Comment: Affects students graduating in 1986-87 (i.e., students entering ninth grade in 1983-84). Students may take one year of foreign language instead of fine arts. Students may substitute "work experience or other outside school experience" for prescribed course of study.

2. Required Local Use of State Curriculum Guidelines

The State Department of Education should develop general curriculum guidelines that identify desireable student competencies in each academic subject area. Districts should be required to revise their curricula in light of these state standards.

In SB 813: Yes Comment: Model curriculum standards to be adopted by January 1, 1985. Districts must compare their curricula to these standards every three years.

3. Strengthened State Testing of Student Performance

The California Assessment Program should be expanded to test science and social studies as well as math, reading and writing. The tests should also be strengthened to measure complex skills more accurately, and should be phased into use at all secondary and some additional elementary grades.

In SB 813: Yes

Comment: Expands required statewide achievement testing to grades 3, 8, and 10, in addition to current requirement to test in grades 6 and 12.

4. Textbook Upgrading

The state should initiate a new textbook review process for grades 9-12, and should strengthen the review process for elementary grades, to insure that textbooks meet the state's curriculum standards.

In SB 813: Yes

Comment: Provides more money for instructional materials for grades 1-8, funds some instructional materials for grades 9-12 for the first time; requires the Superintendent of Public Instruction (SPI) to review available texts in conjunction with setting model curriculum standards for grades 9-12.

5. Strengthened Student Discipline Laws

Discipline laws should be strengthened to require student expulsion for possession of hard drugs or deadly weapons, and for arson, robbery, or extortion. Teachers should be allowed to suspend students from their classes for any length of time, upon agreement of the principal, and should be allowed to initiate procedures for suspending students from school.

In SB 813: Yes

Comment: Repeals, reorganizes and strengthens previous laws relating to student suspension and expulsion. Limits teachers' right to suspend pupil from class to two consecutive days.

6. Strengthened Attendance Laws

Penalties for truant students should be increased, county and district attendance supervision services should be strengthened, and schools with high dropout rates should be required to implement a plan to deal with that problem.

In SB 813: Yes, in limited way Comment: Requires parents of truant students to be notified that they may be violating the law; requires SPI to conduct special dropout study; allows teachers to fail students for excessive absences.

7. Longer School Day and Year

State law should require student attendance at the secondary school level for an amount of time equivalent to at least 300 minutes per day (6 class periods) and 180 full instructional days per year.

In SB 813: Yes Comment: Beginning 1984-85, provides strong financial incentives for districts to implement 180-day school year and longer school day, including six class periods in high schools. For districts that already exceed these standards, imposes financial penalties for any reduction of instructional time below 1982-83 levels.

B. ATTRACT AND RETAIN QUALITY TEACHERS

8. Install New Credentialing/Apprenticeship System

A new teacher certification system should be implemented that would replace current credentialing procedures. An Associate Teacher Credential would be awarded upon completion of academic requirements, student teaching and clinical training, and passage of a state-administered criterion-referenced examination to assess subject area competence. A Senior Teacher Credential would be awarded after a three-year apprenticeship/probationary period and regular performance assessments by a Teacher Assessment Team. Senior Teachers would hold lifetime credentials and be eligible for a Master Teacher Credential, which would be awarded with the consent of a teachers' panel. A Master Teacher would receive a 5-year renewable contract, work

an 11-month year for extra pay, and be responsible for supervising apprentice Associate Teachers as well as a broad range of other duties.

In SB 813: No, except for master teachers Comment: With the exception of master teacher provisions (called "mentor teachers") no CRT credentialing reform recommendations are included. After September 1, 1985, teachers will be required to complete 150 hours of continuing education ever 5 years in order to renew their credentials; this provision is contrary to the CRT recommendation.

9. Provide Scholarships and Loans for Outstanding Students

State-funded student loans and scholarships should be made available to undergraduates with outstanding academic abilities who make a commitment to teach in the public schools for at least five years.

In SB 813: Yes Comment: College loan assumption program will take over up to $8,000 in student loans for teaahers in critical shortage areas who agree to teach for three years.

10. Raise Beginning Teacher Salaries, with an Additional Increment for High Demand Areas

Average beginning teacher salaries should be raised by $3,000 (from $13,500 to $16,500). Beginning salaries for teachers in fields where supply falls critically short of demand and is sensitive to salary levels (e.g., mathematics and science) should be raised by $5,000, to a statewide average of $18,500.

In SB 813: Yes Comment: Thirty percent increase over three years, with $18,000 cap, adjusted for inflation. No increment for high demand areas.

11. Raise General Salary Level in Phases and Trigger by Economic Conditions

The state's general support level for schools should be raised to accommodate a general salary increase in constant dollars phased in over a three-year period. This additional revenue would be triggered by economic conditions.

In SB 813: Yes, for 1983-84 only

Comment: Funds are part of COLA, with details of increases left to local bargaining process. All appropriations and allocations for 1984-85 and beyond were vetoed.

12. Support Summer School for Math/Science and Other High Demand Areas

The state should fund summer school classes in mathematics, science, and other areas where teachers are in high demand and could be attracted to teaching by the prospect of an eleven-month work year with commensurate salary increases.

In SB 813: Yes

C. STRENGTHEN THE QUALITY OF THE CURRENT TEACHING FORCE

13. Reform Teacher Dismissal and Discipline Procedures

State law should be amended to reduce the teacher dismissal notice time from 90 to 30 days, reduce the hearing notice from 30 to 20 days, require a hearing within 30 instead of 60 days, change the hearing from a 3-member commission to an administrative hearing officer, require use of administrative rather than civil discovery proceedings, and allow procedural errors unless they seriously prejudice the outcome. Districts should also be permitted to invoke disciplinary measures short of dismissal, including suspension of pay.

In SB 813: Yes, but could be strengthened

Comment: Differs from CRT recommendation in key details (e.g., maintains three-member commission and civil discovery), but is significant strengthening of previous statutory provisions.

14. Revise Seniority/Layoff Rules

Districts should have flexibility to exempt up to 20 percent of teachers slated for layoff, without regard to seniority, in order to meet district program needs. Districts should also be allowed to rehire teachers without regard to seniority, for the same purposes.

In SB 813: Yes Comment: Gives districts even more flexibility than suggested by CRT recommendation.

15. Require Teachers to Pass a Test in Order to Teach Subjects They Have Not Taught Recently

Teachers who have not taught a subject for three years should be required to pass a test in that subject before being reassigned to teach in that area.

In SB 813: Yes, in weak form Comment: Requires tests for reassigned teachers if they have not taught subject before, or do not have credential or college major in subject to be taught.

16. Tighten Standards for the Award of Emergency and Reciprocity Credentials

Teachers with credentials from other states who seek a California credential should be required to pass the same subject matter test as beginning teachers who seek a regular credential. Emergency permits should require the holder to have a BA, or 90 semester units of college work if the district shows that the emergency was caused by a specific statute. These requirements should be waived for candidates for emergency credentials who can demonstrate special subject knowledge and experience by virtue of their employment or similar work.

In SB 813: No

17. Expand Training Programs

Training programs for teachers should be expanded and improved. Additional Staff Development Centers should be funded, and new Teacher/Resource Centers should be created to provide teachers with knowledge exchange and access to literature, teaching materials, and other resources.

In SB 813: Yes

Comment: Codifies Teacher Education and Computer (TEC) Centers in 15 regions as centers for provision of staff development resources for teachers; emphasis is to be on math and science training. Funds may be set aside by the SPI for exemplary projects, including "programs to encourage industry and business to exchange personnel and other resources with schools."

18. Lower Non-Teaching Workload

The non-instructional workload of teachers should be reduced by changing administrative procedures to lower teachers' paperwork burden, and by providing support for clerical and other assistance that could help free teachers' time for instructional duties.

In SB 813: No

19. Provide Recognition for Outstanding Teachers

The state should establish a system of awards for outstanding teaching, consisting of public recognition ceremonies, official commendations, and cash bonuses.

In SB 813: Yes, sharply modified

Comment: Provides grants to teachers of up to $2,000 for projects to improve instruction.

D. IMPROVE THE QUALITY AND EFFICIENCY OF ADMINISTRATORS

20. Install New Principal Selection and Evaluation Process

A new system for selecting and evaluating school principals should be implemented. A Principal Selection and Evaluation Panel (PSEP) consisting of teachers, school administrators, and district administrators would assist districts in the selection of acting principals. Acting principals would serve for three years. In that time, they would be required to satisfactorily complete a state-approved program of professional preparation. They would be evaluated twice a year by the district, with the assistance of the Principal Selection and Evaluation Panel. Principals would be evaluated by the PSEP every three-years, and the evaluation reported to the school board. Current principals would be evaluated using a similar process. The PSEP would also handle teacher or community grievance actions against principals, and would be responsible for helping principals to obtain continuing training.

In SB 813: No

Comment: Provides for pilot project to help districts improve techniques for selecting and evaluating administrators.

21. Simplify Administrator Removal

Districts should be allowed to dismiss administrators from their administrative positions on 45 days' notice, rather than the current March notice requirements.

In SB 813: Yes

Comment: Also generally prohibits administrators who transfer back to teaching from counting their period of administrative employment for purposes of determining their seniority rights as teachers.

22. Give Boards Authority Over Classified Management

School boards, rather than personnel commissions, should be given authority over top classified management employees such as personnel or transportation directors.

In SB 813: Yes

23. Fund Leadership Training Programs

Leadership training should be strengthened by funding leadership academies, and by providing funds for districts to cooperate with administrator organizations in setting up administrator training centers.

In SB 813: Yes Comment: Programs must operate in conjunction with teacher education and computer centers, and must be based on three-year plan for training activities.

E. INITIATE LOCAL EXPERIMENTS TO STRENGTHEN PERSONNEL AND MANAGEMENT

24. Fund and Evaluate Innovative Local Experiments to Strengthen Personnel and Management

The state should fund up to ten local experiments, lasting from one to three years, to try out innovative approaches to strengthening the teaching profession, improving teaching conditions, and improving the efficiency of school operations. These experiments, which should be systematically evaluated by the state, could include programs to provide new incentives for the more efficienct management of school or district operations; new roles for districts in certifying teachers; school performance contracts, with school staff salary levels tied to overall school performance; merit salary programs; differentiated staffing ideas; innovative uses of technology; or other, locally generated projects.

In SB 813: Yes Comment: Provides for up to five pilot projects per fiscal year, with program terminating July 1, 1985 unless extended by legislature before then. Requires projects to be approved by local teacher bargaining units.

25. Establish Commission on Personnel and Management Reforms

The state should create a new high-level Commission on Personnel and Management Reforms, to gather information from other states and countries, help local districts design experiments, assume responsibility for the evaluation of these experiments, and make recommendations to the legislature, the Governor, and the Superintendent of Public Instruction for responsible next steps in this area.

In SB 813: No

APPENDIX C

BERMAN, WEILER ASSOCIATES' RECOMMENDATIONS FOR A NEW TEACHER CERTIFICATION PROCESS AND A NEW PRINCIPAL SELECTION AND EVALUATION PROCESS

These recommendations were approved by the California Roundtable and provided to legislators, the Governor, and key interest groups.

With the exception of the recommendation for recognizing Distinguished Teachers (i.e., master teachers), the recommendations were not incorporated in SB 813.

BERMAN, WEILER ASSOCIATES RECOMMENDATION
for
A NEW TEACHER CERTIFICATION PROCESS

OVERVIEW

Students of low academic ability have been entering the teaching profession, and public respect for the profession is at a low point. To prevent unqualified teachers from entering the profession, and to attract more high quality people into teaching, the state should establish a new system for certifying the academic quality and teaching ability of beginning teachers, and for recognizing distinguished teachers. Key features of the system would include:

1. Prospective teachers would have to pass an examination that tested their mastery of subject knowledge required for teaching.
2. Prospective teachers would serve an apprenticeship period, where they would learn the craft of teaching and be evaluated and assisted by peers.
3. Local districts and the state would have a major responsibility for training beginning teachers.
4. A small percentage of teachers would be eligible to become Distinguished Teachers, who would have new responsibilities and earn a substantially higher salary for a longer work year.

PROPOSAL
for
A NEW TEACHER CERTIFICATION PROCESS

PROPOSAL

The state should establish a new system for certifying the academic quality and teaching ability of beginning teachers, and for recognizing distinguished teachers. This system, which would replace current certification procedures, would have three levels of credentials: Associate Teacher, Senior Teacher, and Distinguished Teacher.

The Associate Teacher credential would be awarded upon fulfillment of academic requirements (a baccalaureate degree or equivalent), completion of clinical training, and passage of a written examination administered by the state. The clinical training would consist of a full year of observation and practice teaching (beginning with the planning period preceding the opening of school), concurrent with practical training and coursework, offered by institutions of higher education in cooperation with local school districts.

The examination would be a criterion-referenced test created or approved by the state, that would assess the competence of the applicant in comprehensive and specific subject areas. For prospective elementary school teachers, the examination would test general knowledge in psychology, geography, history, English, arithmetic, and related subjects, at a level appropriate for a holder of a bachelor's degree from an accredited four-year college or university. Prospective secondary school teachers would also be tested in more depth in their major fields. The test would have three grades: Full Pass, Partial Pass, and Fail. A candidate receiving a Full Pass would be awarded an Associate Teacher credential, provided that other requirements were met; a candidate receiving a Partial Pass would be awarded an Acting Associate Teacher credential and would be required to retake the exam and receive a Full Pass within three years.

An Acting Associate or Associate Teacher would be able to teach as an apprentice for three years; during that time, the Associate would be required to successfully complete a program of professional preparation.

Half of this program would consist of core academic courses (up to 12 semester units) specified by the state and taught at colleges and universities. The other half of the program would be selected by the district, and developed with the Associate Teacher on an individualized basis. It would consist of additional college or university courses or other training (e.g., through staff development centers and/or other local, county, or regional sources). Each Associate's total professional preparation program--including state-specified core courses--would be approved by the district as a condition of the Associate's apprenticeship.

The teaching performance of the Acting Associate or Associate Teacher would be evaluated regularly by a Teacher Assessment Team (TAT), whose members would consist of a teacher from outside the district who is trained in assessment,* the teacher to whom the Associate is apprenticed, and the school principal in elementary schools or department head in secondary schools. The TAT would be responsible for giving guidance for improvement at each evaluation period, and for submitting a final recommendation at the end of three years for award or denial of a Senior Teacher credential. Award of a Senior Teacher credential would be accompanied by a significant increase in salary.

During the apprenticeship period, employment of an Associate Teacher would be probationary, and the teacher could be suspended or dismissed at the discretion of the district, except for reasonable due process rights.

A Senior Teacher would have a lifetime credential. Employment would be subject to layoff and dismissal procedures embodied in state law and collective bargaining agreements.

Any full-time classroom Senior Teacher would be eligible to be nominated as a Distinguished Teacher candidate. The district would nominate a teacher for this status, with the usual expectation that the teacher had long experience and outstanding competence. The teacher's qualifications would be reviewed by a Distinguished Teacher Panel (DTP), whose three members would all be teachers--one from the candidate's school, one from the candidate's district, and one specially trained teacher from outside the district. The DTP's consent would be required

---

*This teacher would be trained by teacher professional organizations/ unions, who would develop assessment criteria in partnership with the CSDE.

for the award of Distinguished Teacher candidate status. The Distinguished Teacher candidate would serve one year in that position before being evaluated by the DTP, which could recommend to the state the award of a lifetime Distinguished Teacher credential. Upon receipt of a DTP recommendation, the state would be required to award the Distinguished Teacher credential unless there were compelling evidence that it should not do so. If such an award were made, the district could hire the Distinguished Teacher for a five-year renewable contract.

The Distinguished Teacher or candidate would work the equivalent of an 11-month year and receive a 25 percent salary increment, supplied by a state fund. The state fund would grant salary increments for up to 5 percent of the teachers in a district in any one year. The Distinguished Teacher would be responsible for classroom instruction, supervision of apprentice Associate Teachers, serving on DTPs, assisting principals in planning for curriculum and instructional improvement, and playing a leading role in districtwide staff development. A Distinguished Teacher would have a two-month sabbatical every third year.

DISCUSSION

PURPOSE

Evidence shows clearly that students of low academic ability have been entering the teaching profession, and that public respect for the profession is at a low point. To prevent unqualified teachers from entering the profession, and to attract more high quality people into teaching, changes in the current teacher certification system, as well as other reforms, are essential. Without such changes, the public is unlikely to support needed pay increases for teachers.

CURRENT SYSTEM

Under the current certification system, a preliminary credential (good for five years) may be awarded upon completion of:

- A program of undergraduate courses approved by the state Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC), called a subject matter "waiver program";
- A bachelor's degree;

- o Nine units of professional education coursework (e.g., theory of learning), followed by one semester of student teaching;
- o Minor additional course requirements (or passage of an exam) in the teaching of reading and in the U.S. Constitution;
- o Passage of the basic skills proficiency exam (CBEST).

A second level credential, called a clear credential, may be obtained by completing:

- o All requirements for the preliminary credential;
- o A fifth year of study after the B.A.;
- o Minor additional course requirements in health education and the education of exceptional individuals (mainstreaming).

A life credential is awarded after two years of teaching with a clear credential; there are no other life credential requirements.

PROBLEMS WITH THE CURRENT SYSTEM

The system summarized above has the following problems:

1. Despite the bureaucratization of the credentialing process (the CTC has approved more than 1,000 different "waiver programs"), there are no means for insuring that students who have taken approved "waiver program" courses have actually acquired the necessary subject matter knowledge.
2. The professional education/student teaching requirement is an inadequate means of providing essential clinical training.
3. The fifth year of study required for the clear credential is not linked to the actual practice of teaching. Most students use the fifth year to complete their professional education/student teaching requirement, thereby starting with a clear credential.
4. Lifetime credentials are awarded virtually automatically, without adequate review of a candidate's actual teaching proficiency.
5. Teachers have little career flexibility. Their professional lives are largely devoted to classroom teaching alone, with few opportunities to assume new responsibilities or to win special recognition on the basis of exceptional merit.

RATIONALE FOR REFORM

The proposed reform of the credentialing process would address these problems in the following ways:

1. The teacher proficiency exam (CBEST) would be eliminated. This exam is more a test of aptitudes and IQ than of subject knowledge. The test is not difficult enough to reassure the public that it is an adequate professional screening instrument, and the relatively high failure rate has further damaged the image of the profession. A subject matter examination would provide basic assurance that prospective teachers were adequately educated. As a professional screening exam, it would increase the prestige of the profession; and it would eliminate the need for CTC-approved "waiver programs" by directly influencing the undergraduate teacher-preparation curriculum. Prospective teachers would be held responsible for certain areas of knowledge, which they could obtain either through formal coursework or by individual study.

   Criterion-referenced subject matter tests should not be hard to construct. Many existing tests (NTE, SAT, GRE, ACT, etc.) are knowledge based; some colleges also require passage of comprehensive subject matter tests for award of the B.A. Candidates with passing but low scores could still teach before retaking the test, thereby reducing the risk that the passing score would be set at too low a level.

2. Since good teaching is a learned craft that depends on skills in addition to subject matter knowledge, it makes sense to rely on an apprenticeship system to help teach that craft. The apprenticeship period should be three years because (a) it takes time to learn a craft; (b) there should be adequate time to support and evaluate apprentice teachers; and (c) a full three-year apprenticeship period will add to the prestige and attractiveness of the profession. It would be a signal to prospective teachers and to the public that teaching is not just for anyone--that it requires dedication and seriousness of purpose.

   Preparation for the apprenticeship should include (in addition to subject matter study) a full year of clinical training in which

observation and practice teaching are concurrent with courses that emphasize practical teaching skills (e.g., classroom management techniques). The present system requires only one semester of student teaching, which is ordinarily preceded by a semester of coursework, so that observation and practice are not adequately linked to practical instruction or theory.

3. Professional preparation programs should be designed and completed during, not before, a teacher's first years of teaching, so as to insure the relevance of such training to daily on-the-job experience. Responsibility for this training should be shared by local and state agencies.

   A state-specified core professional preparation program would ensure that all teachers were receiving basic professional training from a menu of courses approved according to a common standard. At the same time, school districts are in the best position to assess the professional preparation needs of the apprentice teachers in their schools, and should be required to work with these teachers individually in developing the balance of their professional training programs. School districts would also have the right to approve an apprentice teacher's total professional preparation program--including core courses--prior to the beginning of the apprenticeship period. This acknowledges the fact that some courses are not well taught, even though they cover essential topics specified by the state. District personnel are usually in a good position to know the quality of coursework offered by their local colleges and universities, and should therefore be permitted to approve their apprentice teachers' programs as a way of influencing the quality of those courses.

4. The award of a lifetime credential should constitute an acknowledgement that the candidate has passed a rigorous screening process for entry to the profession. The state-administered, criterion-referenced subject matter exam, combined with the three-year apprenticeship and careful evaluation, would provide this assurance, which the current certification system does not. The use of a Teacher Assessment Team (TAT) to assist and evaluate apprentice teachers would ensure fairness, and is less likely to

be suspected of abuse than an evaluation system depending entirely on district staff.

Early rigorous screening combined with a lifetime credential is preferable to a system that relies on renewable credentials tied to continuing training as a means of assuring teacher quality. The latter system would confuse two different objectives: certification and continuing education. Research shows clearly that inservice training has minimal value for teachers unless they are intrinsically motivated to obtain new information and ideas. Tying such training to the renewal of the credential would virtually guarantee that it would be treated in a mechanistic and pro forma manner--as a requirement to be suffered in order to renew a certificate, rather than a sought-after source of new knowledge. (Similar objections apply to tying salary structures to continuing training.) The best ways to insure that motivated teachers will benefit from continuing training are to attract better people into the profession, upgrade the standards and expectations for teaching, improve the prestige and morale of the profession, improve the quality of administrators, and improve the quality of staff development programs. Renewable credentials would do none of these things.

5. The introduction of the Distinguished Teacher credential acknowledges the need for (a) recognition and more efficient use of the best teachers in the system; (b) the assignment of outstanding teachers to work with apprentice teachers; and (c) the provision of a new career opportunity, to attract top people and to keep good teachers in teaching (rather than moving to administration as the only career step available).

   The reliance on an all-teacher panel to recommend the Distinguished Teacher credential recognizes the importance of teachers assuming more direct responsibility for the upgrading of their profession. A credential, rather than locally-awarded status alone, is important to insure accountability and protect against wholly idiosyncratic local decisions. The credential would automatically be awarded by the CTC, unless there were compelling evidence that it should not do so. This would help to insure that the award process would not become bureaucratized.

BERMAN, WEILER ASSOCIATES RECOMMENDATION
for
A NEW PRINCIPAL SELECTION AND EVALUATION PROCESS

OVERVIEW

Effective principals are a key to school improvement, but districts rarely exercise their authority to enforce high performance standards for principals on an ongoing basis. The recently revised principal credentialing system would probably make matters worse: It would increase the state's role in quality control and thereby weaken the incentives for districts to take responsibility for improving their schools. An improved system for selecting and evaluating principals is needed, or curriculum and personnel reforms will not be implemented effectively.

This proposal would require districts to maintain local Principal Selection and Evaluation Panels (PSEPs). The Panels, whose members would consist of teachers, administrators, and district officials, would:

1. Advise and assist districts in the selection of candidates for acting school principal.
2. Conduct evaluations of principals, and report the evaluation findings to school boards.
3. Help principals obtain continuing training.

PROPOSAL
for
A NEW PRINCIPAL SELECTION AND EVALUATION PROCESS

PROPOSAL

New procedures should be implemented for the selection and evaluation of elementary and secondary school principals. School districts would be required to maintain a new local body, the Principal Selection and Evaluation Panel (PSEP), which would (a) advise and assist districts in the selection of prospective acting principals; and (b) conduct local evaluations of principals. For elementary and junior high school principals, the PSEP would consist of four persons: one teacher selected by the local teacher professional organization/union; one Distinguished Teacher from the school to which a prospective principal would be assigned; one school principal representative of the local chapter of the Association of California School Administrators; and one district-level administrator. For high school principals, the composition of the PSEP would remain the same, except that the second teacher would be a department head rather than a Distinguished Teacher.*

Districts would select acting principals, with the advice and assistance of the PSEP. In order to be an acting principal, a candidate for elementary or junior high school principal would have to have been a classroom teacher for six years or demonstrate equivalent skills in curriculum and instruction. A candidate for senior high school principal would have to demonstrate competence in management and administration, but there would be no state requirement for previous teaching or other school experience.

Acting principals would serve for three years. An acting principal could not be advanced to full principal before having obtained an

---

*PSEP members would be trained jointly by teacher and administrator professional organizations, who would develop selection and evaluation critieria in partnership with the CSDE.

**The PSEP would also advise and assist the district in the selection of principals who had previously served as full principals in other districts.

Administrative Services credential. This credential would be awarded by the CTC upon a candidate's successful completion of:

- o A professional preparation program approved by the CTC;
- o Training in the education of children with exceptional needs; and
- o A CTC-approved program of advanced study.*

Acting principals would be formally evaluated twice a year by the district, with the assistance of the PSEP. These evaluations would serve as a basis for a district decision as to whether an acting principal should be advanced to a full principal position.

All principals would be evaluated by the PSEP every three years, or more often at local option. The evaluation would be reported to the school board. Current principals and principals transferred to a school from within or outside of the district would be evaluated using a similar process.

The Principal Selection and Evaluation Panels would also handle teacher or community grievance actions against principals, and would be responsible for helping principals to obtain continuing training.

DISCUSSION

PURPOSE

The principal is often the key to school improvement, but many principals are not effective school leaders or managers. Districts rarely exercise their authority to rigorously screen, select and evaluate school principals on an ongoing basis. Unless strong measures are taken to improve the procedures for selecting and evaluating school administrators, reforms in student academic standards and personnel will be hard to implement effectively.

---

*The PSEP would also advise and assist the district in the selection of principals who had previously served as full principals in other districts.

CURRENT SYSTEM

Under the current system for selecting and evaluating school principals, an Administrative Services credential may be awarded to any applicant who:

- Holds any California teaching, designated subjects, library, pupil personnel services, or health services credential;
- Has had three full years of experience in the schools (teaching or other work); or has a bachelor's degree and five years of experience, including recent experience, in the technical area named on the designated subjects credential;
- Has completed a professional preparation program approved by the CTC, or a one-year administrative services internship, or has a passing score of at least 673 on the educational administration portion of the NTE, provided the test was taken before May 31, 1979 (this option expires by May 31, 1984);
- Has completed training in the education of children with exceptional needs.

This system applies only to individuals who enrolled in a professional preparation program before July 1, 1982, and who apply for the Administrative Services credential by June 30, 1984. These applicants are issued a five-year, renewable, "clear" credential. All other qualified applicants will be issued a "preliminary," non-renewable credential, good for five years from date of issue or three years from the date of the applicant's initial employment as an administrator, whichever date is later. Upon expiration of the preliminary credential, administrators may secure a five-year renewable Professional Services credential, providing that they:

- Have two years of successful full-time experience as an administrator; and
- Complete a CTC-approved program of advanced study and field internship.

Credentials are granted upon the recommendation of a college or university that provides a CTC-approved professional preparation program, or by a district that has a CTC-approved internship program. The credential authorizes service in any administrative position from coordinator to superintendent.

PROBLEMS WITH THE CURRENT SYSTEM

The administrator certification system described above has the following problems:*

1. A five-year Preliminary Services credential is issued to any candidate who satisfies the state's experience and professional preparation requirements, with no other prior screening. In considering whom to employ as principals (or other administrators), districts are limited to this pool of self-selected candidates.** Many of these candidates seek administrative positions, not because they have the necessary talent or interest, but because they are not happy as teachers, and/or because administration is the only available path to more status and income.
2. Teachers' professional lives and working conditions are powerfully affected by the quality of school principals, but teachers play no part in principals' recruitment, selection or evaluation. Districts have the authority to involve teachers in the process of appointing principals, but virtually never do so.
3. Important role differences between elementary/junior high and senior high principals are largely ignored. Elementary school principals should be able to exercise substantive educational leadership--i.e., they should be experts in curriculum and instruction. (They should be, as their title originally implied, "principal teachers.") In secondary schools, curriculum and instruction issues are largely the province of department heads, specialists, and other faculty, and the principal's responsibilities are genuinely administrative and political.

---

*These comments apply to the revised system that took effect after July 1, 1982.

**Districts generally select principals from among their ranks of vice-principals, as a way of providing some quality control. But vice-principals are originally appointed from the same self-selected pool of administrative credential holders, and their role is so different from that of principals that their probable effectiveness as principals is hard to estimate.

*Five years for the holder of a designated subjects credential.

Given these differences, current certification prerequisites are too broad in some respects, and too narrow in others:

- o For elementary and junior high school principals, the prerequisites are too broad. No more than three years of professional experience* are required, and this experience can be in areas far removed from classroom instruction (e.g., school psychologist, nurse, librarian). This system appears to rest on the assumption that the skills of an elementary school principal can be learned entirely in professional preparation coursework, but are largely divorced from expert knowledge about the main business of the school--teaching.
- o For senior high school principals, the prerequisites are too narrow. Administrative and political talent, rather than either expertise in curriculum and instruction or school experience per se, are most important in this position. The school experience prerequisite unnecessarily restricts the breadth of the candidate pool, which could include competent administrators from many other fields (e.g., juvenile justice, social welfare, business, etc.). Thus, the prerequisite should be restricted to evidence of managerial and administrative competence, and it should not be assumed that three years of experience in schools is adequate prima facia evidence of such competence.

4. A credential is a device for the state's control of principal quality, and recent changes in the law have given the state increased authority to control quality by requiring renewable credentials. This weakens local control, thereby reducing the incentives for districts to assume responsibility in this area. But districts, not the state, are in the best position to assess the quality of their principals, and the state should be helping to strengthen local incentives to act on this knowledge. In short, the recent revisions to the principal credentialing laws go in exactly the wrong direction.

---

*Five years for the holder of a designated subjects credential.

Specifically, the requirement that candidates obtain a Preliminary Services credential before being eligible for employment as a princpal unnecessarily restricts local flexibility and control. Principal effectiveness largely depends on leadership and management abilities that can be sharpened, but not created, by the professional preparation programs required for the credential. The requirement that credentials be renewed every five years confuses credentials (certification of training and experience) with employment (which should depend on ability). Continuing training may be a desirable condition for continued employment, but this decision should be left to local discretion.

RATIONALE FOR REFORM

The proposed reform of the principal selection and evaluation process would address these problems in the following ways:

1. The present system for creating a pool of school principal candidates would be modified. Districts would hire candidates they consider to be qualified, including candidates who have not yet obtained a credential.
2. To involve teachers in decisions on who is qualified to be a school principal, the Principal Selection and Evaluation Panel (PSEP) includes two teachers. The present system, which isolates teachers from involvement in these decisions, reinforces quasi-adversarial ("employee-employer") relationships between teachers and administrators at all levels. A requirement that teachers and administrators cooperate in developing and applying standards for school principals would help to strengthen the more collegial and professional relationships that are necessary for effective schools.
3. Differences between the roles of elementary/junior high school and senior high school principals would be acknowledged by changing the certification prerequisites for each. For elementary and junior high school principals, the school experience prerequisite would be increased to six years, and

experience not related to the development of expertise in curriculum and instruction would no longer be accepted. This recognizes the key role of these principals as instructional leaders. For senior high school principals, the school experience prerequisite would be eliminated, in order to provide a larger pool of prospective candidates. The only prerequisite would be demonstrable competence in management and administration; this recognizes the relative importance of these attributes in the senior high school setting. While some school experience would undoubtedly be helpful, and most candidates will come from the schools, the position should also be open to talented administrators with other backgrounds (much as middle and senior managers move between different kinds of companies in the business world).

4. Local control needs to be reaffirmed, and districts need to assume more responsibility for principal quality. To these ends, the local Principal Selection and Evaluation Panels would evaluate principals at least once every three years and report their findings to their school boards. Districts are often reluctant to perform these evaluative functions and follow through with desirable staffing changes. PSEP evaluations would create pressures for districts to assess their school principals and make necessary staffing adjustments. Districts would not give up any prerogatives to retain, transfer, demote or dismiss school principals, since the PSEP's evaluation findings would be entirely advisory.

   The PSEP evaluation of current principals, and advice to the district on the selection of acting principals, would also provide information about actual administrative skills. Districts cannot know who has the necessary skills simply by knowing who has obtained an Administrative Services credential; the requirements for obtaining this credential are useful, but not strongly related to leadership and administrative abilities.

These recommendations were approved by the California Roundtable and provided to legislators, the Governor, and key interest groups.

With the exception of the recommendation for recognizing Distinguished Teachers (i.e., master teachers), the recommendations were not incorporated in SB 813.

BERMAN, WEILER ASSOCIATES RECOMMENDATION
for
A NEW TEACHER CERTIFICATION PROCESS

OVERVIEW

Students of low academic ability have been entering the teaching profession, and public respect for the profession is at a low point. To prevent unqualified teachers from entering the profession, and to attract more high quality people into teaching, the state should establish a new system for certifying the academic quality and teaching ability of beginning teachers, and for recognizing distinguished teachers. Key features of the system would include:

1. Prospective teachers would have to pass an examination that tested their mastery of subject knowledge required for teaching.
2. Prospective teachers would serve an apprenticeship period, where they would learn the craft of teaching and be evaluated and assisted by peers.
3. Local districts and the state would have a major responsibility for training beginning teachers.
4. A small percentage of teachers would be eligible to become Distinguished Teachers, who would have new responsibilities and earn a substantially higher salary for a longer work year.

PROPOSAL
for
A NEW TEACHER CERTIFICATION PROCESS

PROPOSAL

The state should establish a new system for certifying the academic quality and teaching ability of beginning teachers, and for recognizing distinguished teachers. This system, which would replace current certification procedures, would have three levels of credentials: Associate Teacher, Senior Teacher, and Distinguished Teacher.

The Associate Teacher credential would be awarded upon fulfillment of academic requirements (a baccalaureate degree or equivalent), completion of clinical training, and passage of a written examination administered by the state. The clinical training would consist of a full year of observation and practice teaching (beginning with the planning period preceding the opening of school), concurrent with practical training and coursework, offered by institutions of higher education in cooperation with local school districts.

The examination would be a criterion-referenced test created or approved by the state, that would assess the competence of the applicant in comprehensive and specific subject areas. For prospective elementary school teachers, the examination would test general knowledge in psychology, geography, history, English, arithmetic, and related subjects, at a level appropriate for a holder of a bachelor's degree from an accredited four-year college or university. Prospective secondary school teachers would also be tested in more depth in their major fields. The test would have three grades: Full Pass, Partial Pass, and Fail. A candidate receiving a Full Pass would be awarded an Associate Teacher credential, provided that other requirements were met; a candidate receiving a Partial Pass would be awarded an Acting Associate Teacher credential and would be required to retake the exam and receive a Full Pass within three years.

An Acting Associate or Associate Teacher would be able to teach as an apprentice for three years; during that time, the Associate would be required to successfully complete a program of professional preparation.

Half of this program would consist of core academic courses (up to 12 semester units) specified by the state and taught at colleges and universities. The other half of the program would be selected by the district, and developed with the Associate Teacher on an individualized basis. It would consist of additional college or university courses or other training (e.g., through staff development centers and/or other local, county, or regional sources). Each Associate's total professional preparation program--including state-specified core courses--would be approved by the district as a condition of the Associate's apprenticeship.

The teaching performance of the Acting Associate or Associate Teacher would be evaluated regularly by a Teacher Assessment Team (TAT), whose members would consist of a teacher from outside the district who is trained in assessment,* the teacher to whom the Associate is apprenticed, and the school principal in elementary schools or department head in secondary schools. The TAT would be responsible for giving guidance for improvement at each evaluation period, and for submitting a final recommendation at the end of three years for award or denial of a Senior Teacher credential. Award of a Senior Teacher credential would be accompanied by a significant increase in salary.

During the apprenticeship period, employment of an Associate Teacher would be probationary, and the teacher could be suspended or dismissed at the discretion of the district, except for reasonable due process rights.

A Senior Teacher would have a lifetime credential. Employment would be subject to layoff and dismissal procedures embodied in state law and collective bargaining agreements.

Any full-time classroom Senior Teacher would be eligible to be nominated as a Distinguished Teacher candidate. The district would nominate a teacher for this status, with the usual expectation that the teacher had long experience and outstanding competence. The teacher's qualifications would be reviewed by a Distinguished Teacher Panel (DTP), whose three members would all be teachers--one from the candidate's school, one from the candidate's district, and one specially trained teacher from outside the district. The DTP's consent would be required

---

*This teacher would be trained by teacher professional organizations/ unions, who would develop assessment criteria in partnership with the CSDE.

for the award of Distinguished Teacher candidate status. The Distinguished Teacher candidate would serve one year in that position before being evaluated by the DTP, which could recommend to the state the award of a lifetime Distinguished Teacher credential. Upon receipt of a DTP recommendation, the state would be required to award the Distinguished Teacher credential unless there were compelling evidence that it should not do so. If such an award were made, the district could hire the Distinguished Teacher for a five-year renewable contract.

The Distinguished Teacher or candidate would work the equivalent of an 11-month year and receive a 25 percent salary increment, supplied by a state fund. The state fund would grant salary increments for up to 5 percent of the teachers in a district in any one year. The Distinguished Teacher would be responsible for classroom instruction, supervision of apprentice Associate Teachers, serving on DTPs, assisting principals in planning for curriculum and instructional improvement, and playing a leading role in districtwide staff development. A Distinguished Teacher would have a two-month sabbatical every third year.

DISCUSSION

PURPOSE

Evidence shows clearly that students of low academic ability have been entering the teaching profession, and that public respect for the profession is at a low point. To prevent unqualified teachers from entering the profession, and to attract more high quality people into teaching, changes in the current teacher certification system, as well as other reforms, are essential. Without such changes, the public is unlikely to support needed pay increases for teachers.

CURRENT SYSTEM

Under the current certification system, a preliminary credential (good for five years) may be awarded upon completion of:

- A program of undergraduate courses approved by the state Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC), called a subject matter "waiver program";
- A bachelor's degree;

- Nine units of professional education coursework (e.g., theory of learning), followed by one semester of student teaching;
- Minor additional course requirements (or passage of an exam) in the teaching of reading and in the U.S. Constitution;
- Passage of the basic skills proficiency exam (CBEST).

A second level credential, called a clear credential, may be obtained by completing:

- All requirements for the preliminary credential;
- A fifth year of study after the B.A.;
- Minor additional course requirements in health education and the education of exceptional individuals (mainstreaming).

A life credential is awarded after two years of teaching with a clear credential; there are no other life credential requirements.

PROBLEMS WITH THE CURRENT SYSTEM

The system summarized above has the following problems:

1. Despite the bureaucratization of the credentialing process (the CTC has approved more than 1,000 different "waiver programs"), there are no means for insuring that students who have taken approved "waiver program" courses have actually acquired the necessary subject matter knowledge.
2. The professional education/student teaching requirement is an inadequate means of providing essential clinical training.
3. The fifth year of study required for the clear credential is not linked to the actual practice of teaching. Most students use the fifth year to complete their professional education/student teaching requirement, thereby starting with a clear credential.
4. Lifetime credentials are awarded virtually automatically, without adequate review of a candidate's actual teaching proficiency.
5. Teachers have little career flexibility. Their professional lives are largely devoted to classroom teaching alone, with few opportunities to assume new responsibilities or to win special recognition on the basis of exceptional merit.

RATIONALE FOR REFORM

The proposed reform of the credentialing process would address these problems in the following ways:

1. The teacher proficiency exam (CBEST) would be eliminated. This exam is more a test of aptitudes and IQ than of subject knowledge. The test is not difficult enough to reassure the public that it is an adequate professional screening instrument, and the relatively high failure rate has further damaged the image of the profession. A subject matter examination would provide basic assurance that prospective teachers were adequately educated. As a professional screening exam, it would increase the prestige of the profession; and it would eliminate the need for CTC-approved "waiver programs" by directly influencing the undergraduate teacher-preparation curriculum. Prospective teachers would be held responsible for certain areas of knowledge, which they could obtain either through formal coursework or by individual study.

   Criterion-referenced subject matter tests should not be hard to construct. Many existing tests (NTE, SAT, GRE, ACT, etc.) are knowledge based; some colleges also require passage of comprehensive subject matter tests for award of the B.A. Candidates with passing but low scores could still teach before retaking the test, thereby reducing the risk that the passing score would be set at too low a level.

2. Since good teaching is a learned craft that depends on skills in addition to subject matter knowledge, it makes sense to rely on an apprenticeship system to help teach that craft. The apprenticeship period should be three years because (a) it takes time to learn a craft; (b) there should be adequate time to support and evaluate apprentice teachers; and (c) a full three-year apprenticeship period will add to the prestige and attractiveness of the profession. It would be a signal to prospective teachers and to the public that teaching is not just for anyone--that it requires dedication and seriousness of purpose.

   Preparation for the apprenticeship should include (in addition to subject matter study) a full year of clinical training in which

observation and practice teaching are concurrent with courses that emphasize practical teaching skills (e.g., classroom management techniques). The present system requires only one semester of student teaching, which is ordinarily preceded by a semester of coursework, so that observation and practice are not adequately linked to practical instruction or theory.

3. Professional preparation programs should be designed and completed during, not before, a teacher's first years of teaching, so as to insure the relevance of such training to daily on-the-job experience. Responsibility for this training should be shared by local and state agencies.

   A state-specified core professional preparation program would ensure that all teachers were receiving basic professional training from a menu of courses approved according to a common standard. At the same time, school districts are in the best position to assess the professional preparation needs of the apprentice teachers in their schools, and should be required to work with these teachers individually in developing the balance of their professional training programs. School districts would also have the right to approve an apprentice teacher's total professional preparation program--including core courses--prior to the beginning of the apprenticeship period. This acknowledges the fact that some courses are not well taught, even though they cover essential topics specified by the state. District personnel are usually in a good position to know the quality of coursework offered by their local colleges and universities, and should therefore be permitted to approve their apprentice teachers' programs as a way of influencing the quality of those courses.

4. The award of a lifetime credential should constitute an acknowledgement that the candidate has passed a rigorous screening process for entry to the profession. The state-administered, criterion-referenced subject matter exam, combined with the three-year apprenticeship and careful evaluation, would provide this assurance, which the current certification system does not. The use of a Teacher Assessment Team (TAT) to assist and evaluate apprentice teachers would ensure fairness, and is less likely to

be suspected of abuse than an evaluation system depending entirely on district staff.

Early rigorous screening combined with a lifetime credential is preferable to a system that relies on renewable credentials tied to continuing training as a means of assuring teacher quality. The latter system would confuse two different objectives: certification and continuing education. Research shows clearly that inservice training has minimal value for teachers unless they are intrinsically motivated to obtain new information and ideas. Tying such training to the renewal of the credential would virtually guarantee that it would be treated in a mechanistic and pro forma manner--as a requirement to be suffered in order to renew a certificate, rather than a sought-after source of new knowledge. (Similar objections apply to tying salary structures to continuing training.) The best ways to insure that motivated teachers will benefit from continuing training are to attract better people into the profession, upgrade the standards and expectations for teaching, improve the prestige and morale of the profession, improve the quality of administrators, and improve the quality of staff development programs. Renewable credentials would do none of these things.

5. The introduction of the Distinguished Teacher credential acknowledges the need for (a) recognition and more efficient use of the best teachers in the system; (b) the assignment of outstanding teachers to work with apprentice teachers; and (c) the provision of a new career opportunity, to attract top people and to keep good teachers in teaching (rather than moving to administration as the only career step available).

The reliance on an all-teacher panel to recommend the Distinguished Teacher credential recognizes the importance of teachers assuming more direct responsibility for the upgrading of their profession. A credential, rather than locally-awarded status alone, is important to insure accountability and protect against wholly idiosyncratic local decisions. The credential would automatically be awarded by the CTC, unless there were compelling evidence that it should not do so. This would help to insure that the award process would not become bureaucracized.

BERMAN, WEILER ASSOCIATES RECOMMENDATION
for
A NEW PRINCIPAL SELECTION AND EVALUATION PROCESS

OVERVIEW

Effective principals are a key to school improvement, but districts rarely exercise their authority to enforce high performance standards for principals on an ongoing basis. The recently revised principal credentialing system would probably make matters worse: It would increase the state's role in quality control and thereby weaken the incentives for districts to take responsibility for improving their schools. An improved system for selecting and evaluating principals is needed, or curriculum and personnel reforms will not be implemented effectively.

This proposal would require districts to maintain local Principal Selection and Evaluation Panels (PSEPs). The Panels, whose members would consist of teachers, administrators, and district officials, would:

1. Advise and assist districts in the selection of candidates for acting school principal.
2. Conduct evaluations of principals, and report the evaluation findings to school boards.
3. Help principals obtain continuing training.

PROPOSAL
for
A NEW PRINCIPAL SELECTION AND EVALUATION PROCESS

PROPOSAL

New procedures should be implemented for the selection and evaluation of elementary and secondary school principals. School districts would be required to maintain a new local body, the Principal Selection and Evaluation Panel (PSEP), which would (a) advise and assist districts in the selection of prospective acting principals; and (b) conduct local evaluations of principals. For elementary and junior high school principals, the PSEP would consist of four persons: one teacher selected by the local teacher professional organization/union; one Distinguished Teacher from the school to which a prospective principal would be assigned; one school principal representative of the local chapter of the Association of California School Administrators; and one district-level administrator. For high school principals, the composition of the PSEP would remain the same, except that the second teacher would be a department head rather than a Distinguished Teacher.*

Districts would select acting principals, with the advice and assistance of the PSEP. In order to be an acting principal, a candidate for elementary or junior high school principal would have to have been a classroom teacher for six years or demonstrate equivalent skills in curriculum and instruction. A candidate for senior high school principal would have to demonstrate competence in management and administration, but there would be no state requirement for previous teaching or other school experience.

Acting principals would serve for three years. An acting principal could not be advanced to full principal before having obtained an

---

*PSEP members would be trained jointly by teacher and administrator professional organizations, who would develop selection and evaluation critieria in partnership with the CSDE.

**The PSEP would also advise and assist the district in the selection of principals who had previously served as full principals in other districts.

Administrative Services credential. This credential would be awarded by the CTC upon a candidate's successful completion of:

- o A professional preparation program approved by the CTC;
- o Training in the education of children with exceptional needs; and
- o A CTC-approved program of advanced study.*

Acting principals would be formally evaluated twice a year by the district, with the assistance of the PSEP. These evaluations would serve as a basis for a district decision as to whether an acting principal should be advanced to a full principal position.

All principals would be evaluated by the PSEP every three years, or more often at local option. The evaluation would be reported to the school board. Current principals and principals transferred to a school from within or outside of the district would be evaluated using a similar process.

The Principal Selection and Evaluation Panels would also handle teacher or community grievance actions against principals, and would be responsible for helping principals to obtain continuing training.

DISCUSSION

PURPOSE

The principal is often the key to school improvement, but many principals are not effective school leaders or managers. Districts rarely exercise their authority to rigorously screen, select and evaluate school principals on an ongoing basis. Unless strong measures are taken to improve the procedures for selecting and evaluating school administrators, reforms in student academic standards and personnel will be hard to implement effectively.

---

*The PSEP would also advise and assist the district in the selection of principals who had previously served as full principals in other districts

CURRENT SYSTEM

Under the current system for selecting and evaluating school principals, an Administrative Services credential may be awarded to any applicant who:

- Holds any California teaching, designated subjects, library, pupil personnel services, or health services credential;
- Has had three full years of experience in the schools (teaching or other work); or has a bachelor's degree and five years of experience, including recent experience, in the technical area named on the designated subjects credential;
- Has completed a professional preparation program approved by the CTC, or a one-year administrative services internship, or has a passing score of at least 673 on the educational administration portion of the NTE, provided the test was taken before May 31, 1979 (this option expires by May 31, 1984);
- Has completed training in the education of children with exceptional needs.

This system applies only to individuals who enrolled in a professional preparation program before July 1, 1982, and who apply for the Administrative Services credential by June 30, 1984. These applicants are issued a five-year, renewable, "clear" credential. All other qualified applicants will be issued a "preliminary," non-renewable credential, good for five years from date of issue or three years from the date of the applicant's initial employment as an administrator, whichever date is later. Upon expiration of the preliminary credential, administrators may secure a five-year renewable Professional Services credential, providing that they:

- Have two years of successful full-time experience as an administrator; and
- Complete a CTC-approved program of advanced study and field internship.

Credentials are granted upon the recommendation of a college or university that provides a CTC-approved professional preparation program, or by a district that has a CTC-approved internship program. The credential authorizes service in any administrative position from coordinator to superintendent.

PROBLEMS WITH THE CURRENT SYSTEM

The administrator certification system described above has the following problems:*

1. A five-year Preliminary Services credential is issued to any candidate who satisfies the state's experience and professional preparation requirements, with no other prior screening. In considering whom to employ as principals (or other administrators), districts are limited to this pool of self-selected candidates.** Many of these candidates seek administrative positions, not because they have the necessary talent or interest, but because they are not happy as teachers, and/or because administration is the only available path to more status and income.
2. Teachers' professional lives and working conditions are powerfully affected by the quality of school principals, but teachers play no part in principals' recruitment, selection or evaluation. Districts have the authority to involve teachers in the process of appointing principals, but virtually never do so.
3. Important role differences between elementary/junior high and senior high principals are largely ignored. Elementary school principals should be able to exercise substantive educational leadership--i.e., they should be experts in curriculum and instruction. (They should be, as their title originally implied, "principal teachers.") In secondary schools, curriculum and instruction issues are largely the province of department heads, specialists, and other faculty, and the principal's responsibilities are genuinely administrative and political.

---

*These comments apply to the revised system that took effect after July 1, 1982.

**Districts generally select principals from among their ranks of vice-principals, as a way of providing some quality control. But vice-principals are originally appointed from the same self-selected pool of administrative credential holders, and their role is so different from that of principals that their probable effectiveness as principals is hard to estimate.

*Five years for the holder of a designated subjects credential.

Given these differences, current certification prerequisites are too broad in some respects, and too narrow in others:

- o For elementary and junior high school principals, the prerequisites are too broad. No more than three years of professional experience* are required, and this experience can be in areas far removed from classroom instruction (e.g., school psychologist, nurse, librarian). This system appears to rest on the assumption that the skills of an elementary school principal can be learned entirely in professional preparation coursework, but are largely divorced from expert knowledge about the main business of the school--teaching.
- o For senior high school principals, the prerequisites are too narrow. Administrative and political talent, rather than either expertise in curriculum and instruction or school experience per se, are most important in this position. The school experience prerequisite unnecessarily restricts the breadth of the candidate pool, which could include competent administrators from many other fields (e.g., juvenile justice, social welfare, business, etc.). Thus, the prerequisite should be restricted to evidence of managerial and administrative competence, and it should not be assumed that three years of experience in schools is adequate prima facia evidence of such competence.

4. A credential is a device for the state's control of principal quality, and recent changes in the law have given the state increased authority to control quality by requiring renewable credentials. This weakens local control, thereby reducing the incentives for districts to assume responsibility in this area. But districts, not the state, are in the best position to assess the quality of their principals, and the state should be helping to strengthen local incentives to act on this knowledge. In short, the recent revisions to the principal credentialing laws go in exactly the wrong direction.

---

*Five years for the holder of a designated subjects credential.

Specifically, the requirement that candidates obtain a Preliminary Services credential before being eligible for employment as a princpal unnecessarily restricts local flexibility and control. Principal effectiveness largely depends on leadership and management abilities that can be sharpened, but not created, by the professional preparation programs required for the credential. The requirement that credentials be renewed every five years confuses credentials (certification of training and experience) with employment (which should depend on ability). Continuing training may be a desirable condition for continued employment, but this decision should be left to local discretion.

RATIONALE FOR REFORM

The proposed reform of the principal selection and evaluation process would address these problems in the following ways:

1. The present system for creating a pool of school principal candidates would be modified. Districts would hire candidates they consider to be qualified, including candidates who have not yet obtained a credential.
2. To involve teachers in decisions on who is qualified to be a school principal, the Principal Selection and Evaluation Panel (PSEP) includes two teachers. The present system, which isolates teachers from involvement in these decisions, reinforces quasi-adversarial ("employee-employer") relationships between teachers and administrators at all levels. A requirement that teachers and administrators cooperate in developing and applying standards for school principals would help to strengthen the more collegial and professional relationships that are necessary for effective schools.
3. Differences between the roles of elementary/junior high school and senior high school principals would be acknowledged by changing the certification prerequisites for each. For elementary and junior high school principals, the school experience prerequisite would be increased to six years, and

experience not related to the development of expertise in curriculum and instruction would no longer be accepted. This recognizes the key role of these principals as instructional leaders. For senior high school principals, the schcol experience prerequisite would be eliminated, in order to provide a larger pool of prospective candidates. The only prerequisite would be demonstrable competence in management and administration; this recognizes the relative importance of these attributes in the senior high school setting. While some school experience would undoubtedly be helpful, and most candidates will come from the schools, the position should also be open to talented administrators with other backgrounds (much as middle and senior managers move between different kinds of companies in the business world).

4. Local control needs to be reaffirmed, and districts need to assume more responsibility for principal quality. To these ends, the local Principal Selection and Evaluation Panels would evaluate principals at least once every three years and report their findings to their school boards. Districts are often reluctant to perform these evaluative functions and follow through with desirable staffing changes. PSEP evaluations would create pressures for districts to assess their school principals and make necessary staffing adjustments. Districts would not give up any prerogatives to retain, transfer, demote or dismiss school principals, since the PSEP's evaluation findings would be entirely advisory.

The PSEP evaluation of current principals, and advice to the district on the selection of acting principals, would also provide information about actual administrative skills. Districts cannot know who has the necessary skills simply by knowing who has obtained an Administrative Services credential; the requirements for obtaining this credential are useful, but not strongly related to leadership and administrative abilities.